



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the time *they* had agreed to remain;" reminding us of such speeches as this: "Every passenger must show *their* tickets as *they* go ashore!" Obscurity or inelegance of expression occurs on page 458, vol. i., at the top: "Even at the outposts of Fort Amsterdam men were wounded by the shots of the lurking savages, *who* might, had they known their own power, have exterminated the whites, *who*, in the universal terror, were almost incapable of resistance." On page 7 of Mr. Gay's preface, at the top: "We have received still further and constant *aid* from the latter gentleman, in *help* in the selection and arrangement of illustrations," etc.; on page 2, vol. ii., line twenty-five: "The problem was simplified, for a time at least, *to how* these heathen could be most easily and most *effectually killed*;" on page 10, vol. ii., second line from bottom: "Some of the Puritans held that, *as certainly* as they were the special care of Heaven, so, *as unquestionably*, the Indians were the children of the devil;" and on page 575, vol. ii., line three: "On this plate he *inscribed*, he *asserted* the right of Queen Elizabeth and her successors to that kingdom," etc. But these cases of carelessness are enough for illustration. We have marked many more. Our allotted space, however, is exhausted, and we must conclude with the hope that, when the future volumes of this handsome work shall appear, no such strictures as we have now ventured on will be necessary. Let us add in a word the question, "Have the authors in the first volume, at pages 273, 275, 279, and 287, done justice to Captain John Smith?"

-
- 2.—*The Problem of the Homeric Poems.* By WILLIAM D. GEDDES, LL. D., Professor of Greek in the University of Aberdeen, Scotland. London: Macmillan & Co. 1878.—*Greek Literature.* By R. C. JEBB, M. A., Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow, Scotland. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1878.—*Homer.* By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, Honorary Student of Christ Church, Oxford. D. Appleton & Co. 1878.

It is not more than fifty years since the state of Greek literature in Scotland was such as to reflect no credit on the nation. Latin had always been the favorite study from the days of George Buchanan, who was tutor to King James VI., whose effigy adorns the title-page of *Blackwood's Magazine*, whose "History of Scotland" rivals the Latinity of Livy, and whose poems, written in Latin, rank him as the first British poet of his age. The parochial schoolmasters were always respectable Latin scholars, and sent up

to the four national universities students as well prepared in that language, with the exception of verse-making, as any that entered the two richer and more famous universities of England. The biographies of our Revolutionary sires show us that many or most of them studied Latin under Scotchmen, and for many generations Ruddiman's Latin rules for genders and flexions, and not those of the Eton grammar, were the *vade-mecum* of American schoolboys. But in Greek the case was widely different. Dalziel, and his successor, Dunbar, in the University of Edinburgh, prepared with notes some volumes of extracts from the Greek classics, called "Collectanea," which were long used in the United States, where the Scottish influence still predominated; and those collections were the not very high standard of Greek scholarship in North Britain as late as 1825. Nearly one-half of the students of Scotland went to college without knowing the Greek letters; and the Greek professors, such as they were, found themselves condemned to the drudgery of drilling these in the lowest rudiments of the language. Such a state of things was disgraceful. Oxonians and Cantabs twitted the Scotch with knowing no Greek and little Latin; and unless when some celebrated lecturer like Dugald Stewart at Edinburgh, Thomas Reid at Glasgow, and Thomas Chalmers at St. Andrews, attracted students from afar, few Englishmen ever crossed the northern border to be educated. The University of Glasgow was the first to feel the inferiority so far as to attempt a remedy. Sir Daniel Sandford led the way. Under him studied Tait, the present Archbishop of Canterbury, and Halley, who "beat Tait." Sandford was followed by Lushington, and Lushington by Jebb, the present professor. At Edinburgh the Greek chair is now occupied by the renowned scholar and poet, John Stuart Blackie. At St. Andrews the chair of Greek is filled by Lewis Campbell, LL. D., the accomplished editor of "Sophocles;" and at Aberdeen by Dr. Geddes, whose elaborate treatise on the Homeric question is now under our review, and proves that Aberdeen, in the far northeast, is in Greek not a whit behind the more southern universities of Scotland, and fully up to the mark of any university in Europe.

This retrospect of classical study in Scotland has been suggested by the fact that two of the books whose titles stand rubric to this notice are by Scotch professors, while the third is the work of a Scotchman's son. All three are very able productions. In such brief and elementary treatises as the "Literature Primers," edited by Mr. John Richard Green, M. A., of which series are the little

volumes by Prof. Jebb and Mr. Gladstone, we cannot expect much more than the results of study. Yet these are evidently the results of extensive and profound scholarship; and in many cases the methods of investigation are so clearly indicated as to afford the means of testing their accuracy. Especially on the Homeric problem are detailed the authorities and arguments on which the decision of the question depends.

The Greeks themselves, and indeed all civilized men up to the close of the eighteenth century, were nearly unanimous in believing the "*Iliad*" and the "*Odyssey*" to be the work of one man, called Homer. Toward the close of the reign of Pisistratus, at Athens (B. C. 537-527), he appointed a commission of learned men, presided over by the poet Onomacritus, to collect the poems of Homer. It is generally supposed that an "*Iliad*" and an "*Odyssey*" existed in writing as early as that epoch, but that the text had become deranged, and was mixed up with other poems then popularly ascribed to Homer. The task of the commissioners was to collect and collate all these verses. From this collection our present Greek epics were formed; and not until about 170 B. C. did any doubt arise as to their authenticity and genuineness. At that time a grammarian of Alexandria, called Hellanicus, and one Xenon, asserted that Homer was the author of the "*Iliad*" only, and not of the "*Odyssey*." These men and their followers were called *Chorizontés*—separators—because they separated the two poems in their origin. The adherents of the separators were few; and Aristarchus, an Homeric student, also of Alexandria, wrote against what he called the paradox of Xenon, B. C. 156.

Nearly in this condition the Homeric problem remained till the year 1795 of the Christian era. At that time a German professor, F. A. Wolf, of Halle and Berlin, published his "*Prolegomena*," or introduction to his edition of Homer. He there maintained that neither the "*Iliad*" nor the "*Odyssey*" was originally indited as one poem. Each, he says, was put together from many small unwritten poems that had no common plan. "The '*Iliad*' and the '*Odyssey*' were first formed from these, and first written down by the commission of Pisistratus." Mr. Gladstone holds that the poems in all probability had been committed to writing before the time of Pisistratus, and that the commissioners handled them in this shape. He also believes that one and the same poet, called Homer, was the author of them both. The proofs by which he sustains his belief are exceedingly ingenious, and indeed so un-

answerable apparently that we are not surprised to find Homer's own countrymen, the persons for whom he composed, and who ought to have been his best judges, never suspecting that there could be two Homers, any more than we can suspect that there were two Shakespeares, and that creations so like one another in all their characteristics could proceed from more than one "maker."

But, while there was no dispute among the Greeks as to the authorship of the Homeric poems, there was much difference of opinion, as we all know, concerning the author's birthplace. Nothing need be said here with respect to the claims of the seven cities which contended for the honor of Homer's nativity, but considerable interest attaches itself to the inquiry whether he was an Asiatic Greek, or first saw the light on the Grecian continent, the European peninsula called Peloponnesus. Mr. Gladstone argues as strenuously for a European nativity as for the unity of authorship, although his arguments on the former point are not of equal cogency.

On the other hand, Prof. Jebb inclines to the opinion that the Homeric poems had several authors, and that they were produced in Asia Minor. All the best evidence, he says, connects Homer with Smyrna. But he is much more decided on the question of the bard's birthplace than on the question of his sole authorship.

Between the popular theory and that of Friedrich August Wolf an intermediate one was adopted by Mr. Grote, the celebrated historian of Greece. He holds, as does also Mr. Gladstone, that the title "*Iliad*" is a misnomer. Of course, that name was given long after the Homeric age. What names, if any, the poems bore originally we cannot tell; but Mr. Grote saw clearly that in the "*Iliad*" are comprised two separate stories—one describing the exploits of Achilles, and which should have been called the "*Achilleid*;" another, which recorded the deeds of Diomed, Ajax, Ulysses, Æneas, and the rest, who carried on the war while Achilles brooded in his tent, and to which the name "*Iliad*" might appropriately be applied. He perceived, moreover, that the style and manner of the "*Achilleid*" were superior to those of the "*Iliad*," which more resembled the "*Odyssey*" in character, and was most probably composed by the same author.

This theory of Grote has found favor in the eyes of Prof. Geddes, and he maintains it with marvelous ingenuity, exhaustive research, and great learning. His work is much larger and more elaborate than the primers of Jebb and Gladstone, but it is so full

of interest and information that not scholars only, but all cultivated readers, ought to find pleasure and profit in its pages. To any intelligent man the discussion behooves to be enticing. Curiosity ought to be aroused by the very strangeness of the thesis. By what arguments can it be proved that the "Iliad" is really two works, and that mayhap both "Iliad" and "Odyssey" are not the work of one glorious mind, but a grand mosaic of many divine fragments, as if the stars of heaven were clustered together into one orb of surpassing splendor? Can this be shown with any degree of certainty? Read Geddes and see.

The little treatise of the Glasgow professor gives an account of Greek literature from Homer's time, about 1,000 years B. C., down to the present day. As we have already said, it deals mainly with results, but the erudition of its author is so manifest that every reader will feel himself safe in trusting them. Mr. Gladstone's tract is, like all he writes, quite fascinating; and we cannot at this instant recollect three books more worthy of a place in all libraries than the three which we have thus rapidly noticed.

Although our space is exhausted, we cannot help adding that students of the present generation enjoy a priceless advantage in being furnished with primers compiled by such scholars as Prof. Jebb and the ex-Premier of England.

Since the above notices were written, we have received "A Class-book of Ancient Literature," by Dr. John D. Quackenbos, of Columbia College, which for purity of style, extent of research, and aptness of illustration, ought to take a conspicuous place among the educational helps of the day. It treats of the literature of the Orient as well as that of the Greeks and Romans, and the examples culled from the authors of ancient Egypt, Assyria, China, Persia, Hindostan, and Palestine, are presented in the most elegant translations of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The translations from Greek and Latin are equally well chosen.

3.—*D'Ancona's Italian Popular Poetry. La Poesia popolare Italiana. Studi di* ALESSANDRO D'ANCONA. Livorno. 1878. 16mo, pp. xii.-476.

PROF. D'ANCONA, whose valuable contribution to the history of the early Italian drama was noticed in the last number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, has rendered another great service to the literature of his country by the above work.

The popular poetry of Italy has, during the present century,